

## **REMARKS**

Applicants have timely submitted a Response to the Office Action of January 31, 2006. The Office Action has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are made in response thereto. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

### **I. Summary of the Office Action**

1. Claims 1-24 are currently pending.
2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as purportedly indefinite.
3. No claims were allowed.

### **II. Response to the Office Action**

#### **1. Panel Decision**

The Pre-Appeal Brief Review Panel issued a decision on November 21, 2005, withdrawing the August 3, 2005 Final Office Action and reopening prosecution of the above-captioned application. Thus, there are no art rejections, and the only outstanding issue is a rejection of all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite.

#### **2. Rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as purportedly indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner's rejection is based on an unusual interpretation of Applicants' response to a previous Office Action. In that response, Applicants argued that the Examiner failed to consider the Msdn reference as a whole, by ignoring the limitation of the reference that only one window station can be interactive. The claims, however, are not limited to "one" user computer or "one" content provider. This

argument cannot be construed as a disclaimer of “one” user computer or “one” content provider. Applicants have not disclaimed “one”, and Applicants’ arguments are not inconsistent with this meaning. Accordingly, “at least one” which should be accorded its ordinary meaning of “one” or “more than one” is not indefinite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request this rejection of claims 1-24 be withdrawn and the pending claims allowed.

### **III. Conclusion**

Applicants believe that the above-referenced application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and early notice of allowance to that effect is respectfully requested.


**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Director is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application, including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3250, reference No. 02012.04121. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F. R. § 1.136(a)(3).

If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-835-7512.

Respectfully submitted,

**MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP**

Dated: April 27, 2006



Einar Stole  
Reg. No. 47,272

**Customer No. 000038647**  
**Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP**  
International Square Building  
1850 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 835-7500  
Facsimile: (202) 835-7586